IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

JIMMY D. VAUGHN	§		
	8		
VS.	§	ACTION NO.	4:12-CV-907-Y
	8		
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting	§		
Commissioner of Social Security	§		

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S DECISION

The Court has made an independent review of the following matters in the above-styled and numbered cause:

- 1. The pleadings and record;
- The proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the United States magistrate judge filed on January 3, 2014; and
- Plaintiff's objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States magistrate judge filed on January 17, 2014.

Plaintiff makes the same arguments in his objections that were addressed in detail in the magistrate judge's decision. Plaintiff complains about the lack of specificity with which the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") addressed the criteria set forth in 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1527(c) and 416.927(c) in determining not to give controlling weight to the opinion of his treating physician, Dr. Saldino. Nevertheless, this Court agrees with the magistrate judge that the ALJ sufficiently applied the criteria set out in these regulations to Plaintiff's case and obviously took Dr. Saldino's opinion into consideration in reaching his decision regarding Plaintiff's residual functional capacity. As a result, this Court, after de novo review, concludes that the Commissioner's decision should be affirmed for

Case 4:12-cv-00907-Y Document 20 Filed 02/27/14 Page 2 of 2 PageID 89

the reasons stated in the magistrate judge's decision.

It is ORDERED that the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the magistrate judge should be and are hereby ADOPTED. The decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

SIGNED February 27, 2014.

TERM R. MEANS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

 $^{^1\}mathrm{The}$ Court notes what appears to be a typographical error on page 10 of the magistrate judge's decision, wherein the last line of text refers to "20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1529(c) and 416.927(c)." The Court believes the first reference should instead be to 20 C.F.R. 404.1527(c) and adopts the magistrate judge's decision as so modified.